

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
EASTERN DIVISION

BOBBY J. WILSON,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No.1:09-CV-068-DAS
	)	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,	)	
COMMISSIONER OF	)	
SOCIAL SECURITY,	)	
Defendant.	)	

**ORDER OF REVERSAL AND REMAND**

On motion of Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, Defendant in the above cause and pursuant to the power of this Court to enter a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the Commissioner's decision with remand in Social Security actions under sentence four of section 205(g) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), this Court hereby reverses the Commissioner's decision and remands Plaintiff's claim for further development of the record and the issuance of a new decision.

On remand, the Appeals Council will remand Plaintiff's case to an ALJ. Upon remand, the Administrative Law Judge will be directed to update Plaintiff's medical records; evaluate the severity of Plaintiff's psoriasis to determine whether listing 8.05 is met; delineate the specific residuals from Plaintiff's stroke which impact his ability to perform work-related activities; contact Dr. Ahmed, to resolve the apparent inconsistencies between the clinical evidence and his assessment

of Plaintiff's functional limitations; evaluate Plaintiff's credibility pursuant to SSR 96-7p; evaluate Plaintiff's mental impairment using the special technique outlined in 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520a and 416.920a; if warranted, secure evidence from a medical expert to ascertain the nature and severity of Plaintiff's impairments, resolve inconsistencies in the record and help determine whether the opinions contained in the record are consistent with the evidence; evaluate the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) finding that the claimant was disabled under their rules pursuant to SSR 06-3p; consider treating source opinion pursuant to the provisions of 20 CFR 404.1527 and 416.927 and Social Security Rulings 96-2p; reconsider Plaintiff's maximum residual functional capacity and provide appropriate rationale with specific references to evidence of record in support of the assessed limitations; and, if warranted by the expanded record, obtain supplemental evidence from a vocational expert to clarify the effect of the assessed limitations on Plaintiff's occupational base.

The Clerk of the Court will enter a separate judgment pursuant to Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

SO ORDERED this the 30th day of July, 2009.

/s/ David A. Sanders  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE